**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT
ON PATENTABILITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)**

International application No.
PCT/EP2005/050766

Re Box V
Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1	Reference is made to the following document: 　　　　D1:　US 2002/016669 A1 (RUHL HANS-WILHELM ET AL) 7 　　　　February 2002 (2002-02-07)

2　　　The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 because claims 6, 7, 10 and 12 are not clear.

2.1　　Claim 6 should not be worded as being dependent on claim 7 but rather as being dependent on claim 5.

2.2　　Claims 7, 10 and 12 should not be worded as being dependent on "one of the preceding claims" but rather as being dependent on claim 5 or 6 (for claim 7), on one of the preceding claims 5-9 (for claim 10) and on one of the preceding claims 5-11 (for claim 12). Claims 7, 10 and 12 are device claims and cannot be dependent on a method claim.

3　　INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

3.1　　D1 is regarded as being the prior art closest to the subject matter of claim 1. It discloses (the references between parentheses relate to said document):
a method for selecting a list item from a selection list in an information system in a motor vehicle ("method for selecting a locality name in a motor vehicle navigation system", abstract), a list item ("the search is first performed in the second list", abstract) which is sought either being input by means of a voice input ("voice input system", abstract) in a voice input mode or being manually input ("The navigation system preferably has a manual input device for inputting locality names in a second form of input", page 2, section 23) in a manual input mode, in which
- the list item sought is input as a spoken word in the voice input mode ("the user inputs his desired destination into the navigation system by voice via the voice input unit", page 3, section 32),

- the spoken list item sought is compared with the list items in the selection list ("a comparison is performed between the features of the spoken destination with the features of the phonemes stored in the second list", page 3, section 32),

- given sufficient correspondence between the spoken list item sought and at least one of the list items from the selection list, this at least one list item is selected as a search result ("a check is made whether there is a match and the destination has already been found. If this is so, the destination found can be directly used for the planning of the route", page 3, section 32),

- the system automatically changes over to the manual input mode if there is no sufficient correspondence between the spoken list item sought and at least one of the list entries in the selection list ("If...it was not possible to find the desired destination in the second list or could not be found with sufficient reliability...the user is requested to input the destination in a second form of input...This can be...a manual input of the destination or the spelling of the destination", page 3, section 33).

The subject matter of claim 1 therefore differs from the known method by virtue of the fact that the spoken word is stored before automatically changing over to the manual input mode and the stored voice input signal is compared with those list items in the selection list whose initial part corresponds to the character string which has been manually input if the number of list items determined in this manner is less than a prescribed value and, given sufficient correspondence to one of the list items in the selection list, this list item is selected and an indication of the selection is optically or acoustically output.

The subject matter of claim 1 is thus novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

The problem addressed by the present invention can therefore be considered that of making manual input more efficient.

The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application involves an inventive step (PCT Article 33(3)) for the following reasons:
a manual input is normally compared with all textual list items in order to find the desired list item (as in D1). The invention resides in the realization that the manual input can also be compared with the stored spoken word in order to find the desired list item more quickly in this manner.

3.2   Claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1 and thus likewise meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step.

4   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 5

4.1   Independent claim 5 defines a device corresponding to the method of independent claim 1. Independent claim 5 is consequently also novel and inventive.

4.2   As explained in section 2 of this report, claims 6-13 are dependent on claim 5 and thus likewise meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step.